arXiv:1510.01144v1 [math.CO] 5 Oct 2015

# Minimal number of edges in hypergraph guaranteeing perfect fractional matching and MMS conjecture, complete version

Vladimir Blinovsky*

Instituto de Matematica e Estatistica, USP,
Rua do Matao 1010, 05508- 090, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Institute for Information Transmission Problems,
B. Karetnyi 19, Moscow, Russia,
vblinovs@yandex.ru

**Abstract**

In this paper we prove Ahlswede- Khachatrian conjecture [1] up to finite number of cases, which can be checked using modern computers. From this conjecture follows conjecture from [2] and Manickam-Miklós-Singhi conjecture. This paper is combined from papers [14], [13].

## I. Introduction

For ground set $[n]$ (uniform) *hypergraph* $H(n,k) = (n, E)$ is $[n]$ together with the subset of edges $E \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$. *Perfect fractional matching* of $H$ is the set of nonnegative real numbers $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{|E|}) : \ \alpha_j \geq 0, \ \sum_{j=1}^{|E|} \alpha_j = 1, \ \sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e e = \left(\frac{k}{n}, \dots, \frac{k}{n}\right)$. A hypergraph can not have a perfect fractional matching. In [1] Ahlswede and Khachatrian impose the following

*The author was supported by FAPESP (2012/13341-8, 2013/07699-0) and NUMEC/USP (Project MaCLinC/USP)

**Conjecture 1** *Let $\mathcal{H}_f$ be the set of hypergraphs that do not have perfect fractional matching. Then*

$$p(n,k) \triangleq \max_{H\in\mathcal{H}_f} |E| = \max_{k\geq s\geq 1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-s} \binom{n_s}{i+s}\binom{n-n_s}{k-s-i}, \tag{1}$$

*where $n_s = \lceil ns/k \rceil - 1$.*

In [1] this conjecture was given in other less standard terms (cone dependence) and this drew less attention of the specialists to this problem.

We relax the conditions from this conjecture a little and rewrite them as

$$p(n,k) = \max_{n-1\geq a\geq 1} \sum_{i>ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\binom{n-a}{k-i}. \tag{2}$$

To see that (1) is equivalent to (2), one can mention that the sum above decreases when $a$ decreases from $n_s$ to $n_{s-1}-1$. Now we direct our attention to another problem. Let

$$(\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_n), \beta_j \in R^1, \ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j = 0$$

and

$$U(\{\beta_j\}) = \left\{ e \in \binom{[n]}{k} : \ \sum_{j\in e} \beta_j \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Define

$$q(n,k) = \min_{\{\beta_j\}} |U(\{\beta_j\})|.$$

Next conjecture was imposed in [2].

**Conjecture 2** *The following relation is valid*

$$q(n,k) = \min_{n-1\geq a\geq 1} \sum_{i\geq ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\binom{n-a}{k-i}. \tag{3}$$

The close relation between the problem of determining $p(n,k)$ and the problem of determining $q(n,k)$ was also shown in [2]. In particular it was shown that from Conjecture 1 follows Conjecture 2. Actually, these two problems are the same. We will show this later.

At last we come to Manickam-Miklós-Singhi (MMS) conjecture.

$$q(n,k) = \binom{n-1}{k-1},\ n \geq 4k. \tag{4}$$

From the inequality above it follows that to prove MMS conjecture (assuming that Conjecture 2 is true) we should show that when $n \geq 4k$, then

$$\min_{n-1 \geq a \geq 1} \sum_{i \geq ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\binom{n-a}{k-i} = \binom{n-1}{k-1}. \tag{5}$$

We will do this in the Appendix.

Using natural bijection between subsets of $[n]$ and binary $n$-tuples, we will not make a difference between them.

Now we prove that both problems are equivalent. From this follows that the proof of Conjecture 1 follows from the proof of the Conjecture 2.

Consider $A \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ as the set of vertices of hypersimplex $\Gamma(n,k) \subset R^n$ s.t. convex hull $K(A) \notin \left(\frac{k}{n}, \ldots, \frac{k}{n}\right)$. Then there exists hyperplane

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j y_j = 0,$$

s.t. $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j = 0$ (it contains the center $(k/n, \ldots, k/n)$) and $K(A)$ belongs to one of the opened half spaces on which hyperplane separates $R^n$. Vice versa, if there exists a hyperplane with the above properties, then $K(A) \not\ni (k/n, \ldots, k/n)$. If $A$ is maximal, then

$$M = \left\{ x \in \binom{[n]}{k} :\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j x_j \geq 0 \right\}$$

is minimal .

This shows the equivalence of the problems.

Assume that $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \ldots \geq \omega_n,\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j = 0$. Then such space of omega's has basis $\{z_j,\ j = 1, \ldots, n-1\},\ z_j = (n-j, \ldots, n-j, -j, \ldots, -j)$. Every $y$ from this space has representation

$$y = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j z_j$$

with nonnegative coefficients $y_j \geq 0$. Let's fix $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$. We have ($y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} z_{ji} y_j$):

$$\begin{aligned}(x,y) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_i y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_i \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} z_{ji} y_j \\ = &\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i z_{ji} = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j \left( n \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i - jk \right) \\ = &\; n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i - k \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j y_j.\end{aligned}$$

Once more using the fact that the conditions above are homogeneous and dividing right hand side of the last chain of equations by $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j y_j$ we obtain the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{y_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j y_j} \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i > \frac{k}{n}.$$

Last inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma_j x_j \geq \frac{k}{n}, \gamma_j \geq 0, \; \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma_j = 1.$$

If we consider only the strict inequality

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma_j x_j > \frac{k}{n}, \gamma_j \geq 0, \; \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma_j = 1$$

and try to find the maximal number of its solutions for $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, then it would be exactly problem of determining $p(n,k)$.

From this it follows that

$$p(n,k) = \max_{\{\gamma_j\}} \left| x \in \binom{[n]}{k} : \; \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} x_j \gamma_j > \frac{k}{n} \right|. \tag{6}$$

**History**

As already noticed, the problem of determining $p(n,k)$ was first imposed by Ahlswede and Khachatrian [1]. From their results, using considerations from [2], it can be easily shown that

$$q(n,k) = \binom{n-1}{k-1},\ n \geq 2k^3.$$

In [8] this equality was proved for $n \geq \min\{2k^3, 33k^2\}$. At last, the validness of this equality for $n \geq 10^{46}k$ was proved in [9].

In [2] the connection between two problems was stated and useful facts allowing the reductions of the MMS problem to the problem from paper [1] were found.

**II Proof of Conjecture 1**.

Define

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{z} e^{-\xi^2/} d\xi,$$

Assume, that

$$|(\gamma, x) - k/n| > \delta$$

for some small fixed $\delta$ and some $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_a) : \sum_i \gamma_i = 1,\ \gamma_i > 0$.

Consider the polynomial

$$\prod_{v=1}^{n}(x - x_v) = x^n - a_1 x^{n-1} + a_2 x^{n-1} + (-1)^n a_n = 0. \tag{7}$$

By Vietes theorem the elementary symmetric polynomial

$$\sigma_k(x_i | i \in [n]) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \leq n} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \ldots x_{i_k}$$

whose variables are all roots $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$ of the algebraic equation (7) of degree n assumes values $a_k, k \in [n]$. By exploiting Newtons identities, we can represent the elementary symmetric polynomials by the symmetric polynomials of sum of the equal powers

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 + x_2 + \ + x_n = p_1, \\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \ + x_n^2 = p_2, \\ \ldots \\ x_1^n + x_2^n + \ + x_n^n = p_n. \end{array} \tag{8}$$

This can be applied to solve a system of equations of sum of equal powers

$$s_k(x_i|i \in [n]) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^k,\ k \geq 1.$$

We now reformulate it as the following theorem.

Viete-Newton Theorem. The solution $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$ of the nonlinear system of equations (8) amounts to the all solutions of the algebraic equation (7) of degree n, where the coefficients $a_1, a_2, ..., a_n$ equation (7) are determined by

$$a_\nu = \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{\mu=1}^{\nu} (-1)^{\mu-1} p_\mu a_{\nu-\mu}, \nu \in [n];\ a_0 = 1$$

The most important issue for us is that the system of equations (8) has unique solution up to permutation of coordinates. Now define

$$f_{m,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \sum_{x \in \binom{[n]}{k}, i \in x, a \notin x} e^{-m((\gamma,x)-k/n)^2/(2\sigma^2)} - \sum_{x \in \binom{[n]}{k}, a \in x, 1 \notin x} e^{-m((\gamma,x)-k/n)^2/(2\sigma^2)}. \tag{9}$$

Also define

$$f_i(\gamma) = e^{1/g} \left( 1 - \left( 1 - (f_{1,i} + f_i) e^{-1/g} \right) \prod_{m=2}^{\binom{n-2}{k-1}} \left( 1 - f_{m,i} e^{-1/g} \right) \right), g > 0,$$

where

$$f_i = \frac{\lambda_{i,1} e^{-1/g}}{1 + \lambda_{i,2} e^{-1/g}}$$

is chosen in such a way, that

$$f_i(\gamma) = \sum_{m=1}^{\binom{n-2}{k-1}} f_{m,i}.$$

It is easy to see that $f_i(\gamma)$ is derivative of the function

$$f(\gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^{\binom{n-2}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \Phi \left( \frac{(\gamma, x) - k/n}{\sigma} \sqrt{j} \right)$$

and

$$f(\gamma) \to \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\binom{n-2}{k-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \right) |\mathcal{A}|$$

as $\sigma \to 0$. Here $\mathcal{A}$ is the set from $\binom{[n]}{k}$, which determined by the inequality $(\gamma, x) > k/n$. Thus to find the extremum of $|\mathcal{A}|$ it is necessary to find the solutions of the equation,

$$f_i(\gamma) = 0,\ i = 1, \ldots, a-1,$$

which is equivalent to the system of equations

$$f_{1,i} + f_i = 0,\ f_{m,i} = 0,\ k \in \left\{ 2, \ldots \binom{n-2}{k-1} \right\},\ i \in [a-1]. \tag{10}$$

But if we fix negative terms in each $f_{m,i}$ for given $i$ we obtain exactly system of equations (2). Little problem here is that equation $f_{1,i} + f_i = 0$ contains additional term $f_i$, but because $\lambda_{i,1}, \lambda_{i,2}$ are bounded and $g$ can be chosen arbitrary small, solution of the system (2) is continuous in $p_i$, we can assume that $g = 0$ and skip $f_i$ in these equalities. We obtain that these equalities have unique solution, which consequently up to permutation coincide with fixed negative exponents. Hence we obtain solution which is unique and thus we prove, that the global extremum of $f(\gamma)$ achieved when exponents in the negative parts of $f_{m,i}$ pairwise (in some order) coincide with exponents in the positive parts of $f_{m,i}$.

Assume next that $k < n$. and w.l.o.g. that $\gamma_1 \geq \ldots \geq \gamma_{n-1}$. Since we have the restrictions $\gamma_j \geq 0$, we should look for the extremum among $\gamma$ such that

$$\gamma_{a+1} = \ldots, \gamma_{n-1} = 0,\ a = 1, \ldots n-1.$$

($a = n-1$ means that we are not imposing any zero condition on $\gamma$.) Assume that this condition is valid for some $a \geq 5$. Case when $a \leq 4$ is easy.

It follows that we should assume that for each given $j \in [a-1]$

$$\left( (\gamma, x) - \frac{k}{n} \right)^2 = \left( (\gamma, y) - \frac{k}{n} \right)^2 \tag{11}$$

where $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}, j \in x$, $y \in \binom{[n]}{k}, a \in y$ and $x \setminus j$, $y \setminus a$ run over all sets of cardinality $k-1$ from $[n-j-a]$. We rewrite equalities (11) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma_j^2 + (\gamma_{j_1} + \ldots, \gamma_{j_{k-1}})^2 - 2\frac{k}{n}\gamma_j - 2\frac{k}{n}(\gamma_{j_1} + \ldots, \gamma_{j_{k-1}}) \\ + \quad & \gamma_j(\gamma_{j_1} + \ldots, \gamma_{j_{k-1}}) = \\ & \gamma_a^2 + (\gamma_{m_1} + \ldots, \gamma_{m_{k-1}})^2 - 2\frac{k}{n}\gamma_a - 2\frac{k}{n}(\gamma_{m_1} + \ldots, \gamma_{m_{k-1}}) \\ + \quad & \gamma_a(\gamma_{m_1} + \ldots, \gamma_{,m_{k-1}}) \end{aligned}$$

Summing both sides of these equality over all permissible choices of $j_1, \ldots, j_{k-1}$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_{k-1}$ leads to the equality

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{n-2}{k-1}\left(\gamma_j^2 - 2\frac{k}{n}\gamma_j\right) - 2\frac{k}{n}R + 2\gamma_j R \\ = \quad & \binom{n-2}{k-1}\left(\gamma_a^2 - 2\frac{k}{n}\gamma_a\right) - 2\frac{k}{n}R + 2\gamma_a R \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where

$$R = \sum_{x \in \binom{[n]\setminus\{j,a\}}{k-1}} (\gamma, x) = \binom{n-3}{k-2} \sum_{m \neq j,a} \gamma_m = \binom{n-3}{k-2}(1 - \gamma_j - \gamma_a).$$

Denote by $\mu$ the terms $\frac{k}{n}$ in (12). From (12) follows, that $\gamma_j$ can take at most two values:

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma_j = \gamma_a, \\ & \gamma_j + \gamma_a = \lambda \triangleq 2\frac{\mu - \frac{k-1}{n-2}}{1 - 2\frac{k-1}{n-2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Note, that we can vary $\mu$ a little bit without violation of all previous considerations. Next we show how we can skip the possibility that $\gamma_j$ takes second value. Assume at first that to each $x$ such that $|x \bigcap [a]| = p$ corresponds some $y$ such that $|y \bigcap [a]| = p$ for all $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ and $p$. For given $p$ we sum left and right sides of the relation (11) over $x$ and corresponding $y$ such that $|x \bigcap [a]| = p$. Then similar to the case of summation over all $x$, we obtain two possibilities:

$$\gamma_j = \gamma_a$$

or

$$\gamma_j + \gamma_a = 2\frac{\frac{k}{n} - \frac{p}{a}}{1 - 2\frac{p}{a}} \tag{14}$$

Because we can vary $p$ it follows, that last equality for some $p$ contradicts to the second equality from (13).

Now assume that for some $b$

$$\gamma_j = \begin{cases} \lambda - \gamma_a, & j \leq b, \\ \gamma_a, & j \in [b+1, a]. \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

Because $\sum_j \gamma_j = 1$ we have the following condition on $\gamma_a$ and $\frac{k}{n}$:

$$b\lambda + (a - 2b)\gamma_a = 1. \tag{16}$$

Let's $\gamma_j = \lambda - \gamma_a$. Assume also that for some $x$ such that $|x \bigcap [a]| = p$ corresponds some $y$ such that $|y \bigcap [a]| = q$ for some $p \neq q$. From (11) follows that there exists two possibilities

$$(\gamma, x) = (\gamma, y)$$

or

$$(\gamma, x) + (\gamma, y) = 2\frac{k}{n}. \tag{17}$$

Each of these equalities impose the condition- first equality the condition (for some integers $p_1, p_2$)

$$p_1\gamma_a + p_2\lambda = 0$$

which can be inconsistent with equality (16) or together with equality (16) determine the value $\mu$.

From the other side if equality (17) impose the condition (for some integers $p_3, p_4$)

$$p_3\gamma_a + p_4\lambda = 2\frac{k}{n}. \tag{18}$$

It is possible that equality (16) together with equality (18) does not determine the value $k/n$. In this case we there can be next two possibilities. First possibility that there exists $x : |x \bigcap [a]| = m$ (where $m$ can be equal to $p$ or $q$) sand there exists corresponding $y : |y \bigcap [a]| = v$ where $v \neq p, q$

Second possibility is that each $x : |x \bigcap [a]| = m$, here $m \neq p, q$ correspond to $y : |y \bigcap [a]| = m$. In this, second case we return to the case which leads to

the equalities (14) (because when $a \geq 5$ the number of such $m \neq p, q$ is greater that 1).

If we have the first possibility, then we have one additional equation

$$q_3\gamma_a + q_4\lambda = 2\frac{k}{n} \tag{19}$$

which together with (16) and (18) are inconsistent or determine unique value of $\frac{k}{n}$.

We see, that if $b > 1$, and $\gamma_j = \lambda - \gamma_a$ when $j \leq b$, then value of $k/n$ can take values only from some discrete finite set. Considering another number $\mu$ instead of $k/n$, which is sufficiently close to the value $k/n$ we can achieve the situation that neither of the obtained values are equal to $\mu$.

Hence we can restrict ourselves on the solution $\gamma_1 = \ldots = \gamma_a = 1/a$.

From this follows Conjecture 1.

**Appendix**

Let's fist mention the fact that if $k|n$, then $q(n,k) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$. This easily follows from the Lemma from [7].

Next we will use the fact that if

$$p(n,k) = \binom{n-1}{k},$$

then

$$p(n+k,k) = \binom{n+k-1}{k}.$$

The proof using double counting argument can be found in [10] (only $q(n,k)$ was considered but the problem for $p(n,k)$ is equivalent). Thus we can assume that $k \in (n/5, n/4)$.

Next we assume that $n \not| ka$. We estimate the probability $P(k \leq ka/n)$ in several steps. First we use Berry-Esseen inequality for Hypergeometric distribution. We will use considerations from [12]. The problem is that in [12] they did not calculate the constant C in inequality

$$\left| P\left(a < \frac{i - ka/n}{\sigma} \leq b\right) - (\Phi(b) - \Phi(a)) \right| < \frac{C}{\sigma},$$

where

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{ka}{n}\left(1-\frac{a}{n}\right)\left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right). \tag{20}$$

Hence we have to repeat those considerations in a way that allows us to obtain the proper upper bound for $C$. We refer the reader to the paper [12] for details. We only care about estimations of the constant in Theorem 2.2.

Let $\delta = 1/20$ and $\sigma > 55,\ n > 12\cdot 10^4$, $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp(-x^2/2), \Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-z^2/2}dz$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &= \max\{i\in Z_+ :\ \tilde{x}(i)\geq -\delta\sigma\},\\ K_1 &= \min\{i\in Z_+ : \tilde{x}(i)\geq -1\},\\ K_0 &= \max\{i\in Z_+ :\ \tilde{x}\leq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{x}(i) = \frac{i-ka/n}{\sigma}.$$

Then (formula (3.15) in [12])

$$\Delta \triangleq P(i<K) + \sum_{i=K}^{\lfloor ka/n\rfloor}\left|P(i)-\frac{1}{\sigma}\phi(\tilde{x}(i))\right| + \left|\sum_{j=K}^{\lfloor ka/n\rfloor}\frac{1}{\sigma}\phi(\tilde{x}(j)) - \Phi(x)\right| = I_1+I_2+I_3.$$

Since $K_2-1 < ka/n-\delta\sigma^2 \leq K_2$ and using Chebyshev inequality we obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= P(i\leq K_2-1) \leq P\left(\left|\frac{i-ka/n}{\sigma}\right| \geq \left|\frac{K_2-ka/n-1}{\sigma}\right|\right)\\ &\leq \frac{\mathrm{Var}(i)}{(K_2-1-ka/n)^2} \leq \frac{n\sigma^2}{n-1}(\delta\sigma^2)^{-2} < 0.1323. \end{aligned}$$

Next we have (inequality (3.20) in [12], we take into account that $k\in(n/5, n/4)$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=K_2}^{\lfloor ka/n\rfloor}\left|P(i)-\frac{1}{\sigma}\phi(\tilde{x}(i))\right|\\ \leq\ & \frac{17}{3\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2}\exp\{\sigma^{-2}\}\left(2\int_0^{\infty}x^3\exp(-0.07x^2) + \left(\frac{4(3/(2\cdot 0.07))^{3/2}}{\sigma}\right)\exp((-3/2)^2)\right)\\ <\ & \frac{17}{3\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2}\exp\{\sigma^{-2}\}\cdot 16 < \frac{60}{\sigma^2}\exp\{\sigma^{-2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality differ from (3.20) because we transform it with the usage of inequality

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} g(ih) = 2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g(ih) \le 2\int_0^{\infty} g(x)dx + 4hg(x_0),$$

which is true for symmetric nonnegative unimodal on $[0,\infty)$ function $g$ with (one of two) maximum in $x_0$ and $h > 0$. We use it to approximate the sum in (3.20) as follows

$$\sum_{j=K_2}^{\lfloor ka/n \rfloor} |\tilde{x}(j)|^3 \exp(-0.07\tilde{x}^2(i))$$
$$\le \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^3 \exp((-0.07)x^2)dx + \frac{4(3/(2\cdot 0.07))^{(3/2)}}{\sigma}\exp(-(3/2)) < 16.$$

Next (relations (3.22) in [12]):

$$\sum_{i=K_1}^{K_0} \left| P(i) - \frac{1}{\sigma}\phi(\tilde{x}(i)) \right|$$
$$\le \frac{85}{12\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}\exp\{\sigma^{-1}\} < \frac{3}{\sigma}\exp\{\sigma^{-1}\}.$$

Thus

$$I_2 \le \frac{60}{\sigma^2}\exp\{\sigma^{-2}\} + \frac{3}{\sigma}\exp\{\sigma^{-1}\} < 0.077.$$

At last, for $I_3$ we have the estimation (inequality (3.22) in [12]):

$$I_3 \le \frac{1}{12\sigma^2}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} + 1 + \frac{10}{\sqrt{2\pi}} exp\{-1/(8\sigma^2)\right]$$
$$+ \quad \Phi(1/(2\sigma) - \Phi(-1/(2\sigma)) + \Phi(-\delta\sigma + 1/(2\sigma))$$
$$\le \frac{1}{12\sigma^2}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} + 1 + \frac{10}{\sqrt{2\pi}} exp\{-1/(8\sigma^2)\right]$$
$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} + \frac{\exp(-(\delta\sigma - 1/(2\sigma))^2/2)}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\delta\sigma - 1/(2\sigma))} < 0.011.$$

Provided that $\sigma > 55, n > 12\cdot 10^4$, we obtain from the last considerations the inequalities

$$I_1 + I_2 + I_3 < 0.2203$$

Hence Berry-Esseen inequality looks like

$$\left|P(i \leq ka/n) - \frac{1}{2}\right| = \left|P(i > ka/n) - \frac{1}{2}\right| < 0.2203 < 1/4.$$

Thus in this case it follows that for $k \in (n/5, n/4)$

$$P(i > ka/n)\binom{n}{k} \leq \binom{n-1}{k}. \tag{21}$$

Using formula (20) for $\sigma$ it can be easily seen that the condition $\sigma \geq 55$ is satisfied when $a \in [n/5, n - n/5]$ and $n > 12 \cdot 10^4$ . Next consideration helps us to reduce the possible values of $a$ for which (21) is valid to $a \in [C, n - C]$, for some constant $C$. Using Stirling formula it is easy to see that when $i \leq ka/n$, the following inequality is valid

$$\frac{\binom{n-a}{k-i}}{\binom{n}{k}} < 2^{(n-a)H\left(\frac{k-i}{n-a}\right) - nH\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)} \frac{\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}\left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{k-i}{n-a}\right)\left(1-\frac{k-i}{n-a}\right)\left(1-\frac{a}{n}\right)}} e^{\frac{1}{12n} + \frac{1}{12(k-i)} + \frac{1}{12(n-a-k+i)}}.$$

Since we can assume that $i < ka/n$ and that $n > 12 \cdot 10^4, a \leq n/5$ we obtain the estimation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{n-a}{k-i}}{\binom{n}{k}} &\leq \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^i \left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)^{a-i} \left(1-\frac{a}{n}\right)^{-1/2} e^{10^{-3}} \\ &\leq 1.1203 \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^i \left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)^{a-i}. \end{aligned}$$

This is true, because when $i \leq ka/n$ we have

$$(n-a)H\left(\frac{k-i}{n-a}\right) - H\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \leq i \ln \frac{k}{n} + (a-i)\ln\left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i<ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\binom{n-a}{k-i} \leq 1.1203 \sum_{i<ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^i \left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)^{a-i}\binom{n}{k}. \tag{22}$$

To estimate the sum

$$\sum_{i<ka/n} \binom{a}{i} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^i \left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)^{a-i}$$

we note that this is the probability $P_0$ that the sum of $a$ i.i.d. Bernulli variables exceeds the average and we use Berry-Esseen inequality [11] (we relax the coefficients a little):

$$\left|P_0 - \frac{1}{2}\right| < \frac{\rho + 0.43\sigma_1^3}{3\sigma_1^3\sqrt{a}},$$

where $\sigma_1^2 = \frac{k}{n}\left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right) \geq \frac{5}{25}$ and $\rho = \sigma_1^2(1-2\sigma_1^2)$. Thus

$$\left|P_0 - \frac{1}{2}\right| < \frac{0.71}{\sqrt{a}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i<ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\binom{n-a}{k-i} &\leq 1.026 \sum_{i>ka/n} \binom{a}{i} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^i \left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)^{a-i} \binom{n}{k} \\ < \quad 1.1203 &\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.71}{\sqrt{a}}\right)\binom{n}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

R.h.s. of the last inequality is less than $\binom{n-1}{k}$ when

$$1.1203\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.71}{\sqrt{a}}\right) < \frac{3}{4}$$

or when $a > 14$. Next if $a = n - b > n - n/5$, then we can rewrite the sum in the l.h.s of (22) as

$$\sum_{i<kb/n} \binom{b}{i}\binom{n-b}{k-i}.$$

To estimate the ratio

$$\frac{\binom{n-b}{i}}{\binom{n}{k}},$$

repeat the previous arguments for $b$ instead of $a$ to obtain

$$\sum_{i<kb/n} \binom{b}{i}\binom{n-b}{k-i} \leq 3/4\binom{n}{k}$$

when $b = n - a < 9$.

**Remark**

For $k \leq n/4,\ n < 12 \cdot 10^4$ the inequality

$$\sum_{i>ka/n} \binom{a}{i}\binom{n-a}{k-i} \leq \binom{n-1}{k}$$

can be checked using the software Wolfram Mathematica, but it needs fast computer. For $a \leq 14, a \geq n - 14,\ k \leq n/4$ it can be done by hand.

# References


[1] R.Ahlswede, L.Khachatrian," Cone Dependence-A Basic Combinatorial Concept", Des. Codes Cryptogr., 29: 1-3 (2003), 29-40

[2] H.Aydinian, V.Blinovsky, "A Remark on the Problem of Nonnegative k-Sums", Problems of Inform. Transmission, Vol.48, N4, 2012, 56-61

[3] T. Bier ,"A Distribution Invariant gssociation Schemes and Strongly regular Graphs", Linear Algebra Appl., 57, (1984), 105- 113

[4] T.Bier, N.Manickam," The first Distribution Invariant of the Jonson-Scheme", Southeast Asian Bull. Math., 11:1, (1987), 68-68

[5] N.Manickam, D.Miklós, "On the number of Nonegative Partial Sums of Nonegative Sum", Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 52, (1988), 385- 392

[6] N.Manickam, N.Singhi, "First Distribution Invariants and EKR Theorems", J.Combin. Theory Ser.A, 48:1,(1988),91-103

[7] Z.Baranyai, "On the Factorization of the Complete Uniform Hypergraph", Math. Soc. Jánow Bolyai, 10 (1975), 91-108

[8] N.Alon, H.Huang, B.Sudakov,"Nonegative k-Sums, Fractional Covers and Probability of Small Deviations", J.Combin.Theory Ser.B, 102:3, 784-796

[9] A.Pokrovsky, "A linear Bound on the Manickam-Miklos-Singhi Conjecture, http://arxiv-web3.library.cornell.edu/pdf/1308.2176v1.pdf

[10] A.Chowdhury, "A Note on the Manickam-Miklós-Singhi Conjecture, April 2013, http://www.math.cmu.edu/∼ameera/research/MMSidea.pdf

[11] I.Shevtsova, "On Absolute Constants in the Berry-Esseen Type Inequalities for Identically distributed Summands", http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.6554

[12] S.Lahiri, A.Chatter,"A Berry-Esseen Theorem for Hypergeometric Probabilities Under Minimal Conditions", Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol.135, N5, 2007, 1535- 1545

[13] V.Blinovsky, "Minimal Number of Edges in Hypergraph guaranteeing Perfect Fractional Matching and MMS Conjecture", https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.0989

[14] V.Blinovsky, "Comments to Symmetrical Smoothing Method and first step to How to Avoid Irrelevant Extremums", https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.04963